

ISEMAN, CUNNINGHAM, RIESTER & HYDE, LLP MICHAEL J. CUNNINGHAM, ESQ.
9 Thurlow Terrace

Albany, New York 12203

and

MACKENZIE HUGHES, LLP

101 South Salina Street

P.O. Box 4967

Syracuse, New York 13221

Attorneys for Defendants Robert J. Congel,

Woodchuck Hill Associates, Riesling

Associates, Madeira Associates, Moselle Associates,

and James Tuozzolo

STEPHEN T. HELMER, ESQ.

WINSTON & STRAWN

1700 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

and

DADD AND NELSON

11 Exchange Street

P.O. Box 238

Attica, New York 14011

Attorneys for Defendants Pyramid Company of

Onondaga and EklecCo

JAMES E. SHARP, ESQ.

GORDON COFFEE, ESQ.

KRISTA ENNS, ESQ.

ERIC T. DADD, ESQ.

KING & SPALDING

1185 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036

and

KING & SPALDING

1730 Pennsylvania Avenue

N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Attorneys for Defendants Marc A. Malfitano

and Robert Brvenik

EDWARD G. KEHOE, ESQ.

KIRKLAND & ELLIS

655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.

Suite 1200

Washington, D.C. 20005

and

COSTELLO, COONEY & FEARON, LLP

Salina Place, 205 South Salina Street

Syracuse, New York 13202

Attorneys for Defendant Scott R. Congel

JAMES P. GILLESPIE, ESQ.

REBECCA R. ANZIDEI, ESQ.

EDWARD G. MELVIN, ESQ.

ROBERT SMITH, ESQ.

HISCOCK, BARCLAY LAW FIRM

Fifth Floor

50 Beaver Street

Albany, New York 12207-2830

Attorneys for Intervenors

MICHAEL J. GRYGIEL, ESQ.

Hon. Norman A. Mordue, Chief U.S. District Judge

MEMORANDUM-DECISION AND ORDER

Defendants move (Dkt. No. 495) for reconsideration of so much of the Court's Memorandum-Decision and Order dated March 31, 2006 (Dkt. No. 482) as denied summary judgment dismissing plaintiffs' claim under 18 U.S.C. § 1962(a) with respect to S&R and denied summary judgment dismissing plaintiffs' claim under 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c) with respect to all defendants. Defendants contend that reconsideration is warranted by the decision by the United States Supreme Court in *Anza v. Ideal Steel Supply Corp.*, ___U.S. ___, 126 S.Ct. 1991 (2006),
☒ reversing the Second Circuit's decision in *Ideal Steel Supply Corp. v. Anza*, 373 F.3d 251 (2d Cir. 2004). Plaintiffs oppose the motion (Dkt. No. 508).

The Supreme Court decided *Anza* on June 5, 2006. On July 9, 2006, the case at bar was deemed trial ready. The docket reflects communications among the Court and counsel throughout the rest of the month of June regarding a trial date and a schedule for pretrial submissions. Under
☒ the circumstances in this case, defendants' motion, filed July 31, 2006 – 56 days after the *Anza* decision and 33 days after the final trial date was set – was not made within a reasonable time as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). Reconsideration is denied on the ground of untimeliness.

In any event, even if the Court were to address the merits of the motion, it would deny reconsideration. In its March 31, 2006 Memorandum-Decision and Order, this Court did not rely on the reasoning of the Second Circuit in *Anza*.¹ Nor does the Supreme Court's decision in *Anza* and its discussion of *Holmes v. Securities Investor Protection Corp.*, 503 U.S. 258 (1992), materially alter the law as applied by this Court in the instant case. This Court expressly applied the *Holmes* standard in requiring record evidence of "a direct relation between the injury asserted

¹

This Court's sole citation to the Second Circuit's *Anza* holding in the March 31, 2006 decision was a "see generally" citation in the context of the denial of S&R's request for summary judgment on plaintiffs' section 1962(a) claim.

and the injurious conduct alleged.” While the Court might have worded its discussion somewhat differently if it had had the benefit of the *Anza* decision, this Court’s essential findings, analysis, and holding are not affected by *Anza*. Nothing in the Supreme Court’s *Anza* decision constitutes an intervening change in controlling law warranting reconsideration.

It is therefore

ORDERED that the defendants’ motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 485) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

September 14, 2006
Syracuse, New York



Norman A. Mordue
Chief United States District Court Judge

N

V

W